same time that the American people gave the President a decisive mandate for peace along the lines that he had promised it, they also gave a decisive vote of confidence to the Democratic Party in Congress and in the State houses. The Democratic majority has been increased in the Senate, indicating the people's intent and expectation that Congress would exercise its constitutional authority with energy and independence.

The matter in any case is not partisan. The opposition to the war was initiated 7 years ago by Democratic Congressmen and Senators against a Democratic administration. Many Republicans have actively opposed their own administration's policy of continuing the war. Now, more than ever, it is the responsibility of members of both parties in Congress to use the legislature's power to cut off funds to end the war in Vietnam.

I believe that Congress can and should act decisively immediately after the inauguration. In the first instance Mr. Kissinger, or Secretary Rogers, should appear before appropriate congressional committees in the first day of the new session to explain the breakdown of the peace talks. They were invited to meet with the Foreign Relations Committee in advance of the new session, on January 2, but both declined. Should the administration refuse to allow its spokesmen to testify, the Congress should proceed on an urgent basis to consider legislation to regulate the practice of so-called executive privilege. Congress and the American people have not only the right, but the responsibility, to call their leaders to explain and—if they can—justify in public the extraordinary actions of the last two months. These actions, couched in secrecy, represent a blatant repudiation of the explicit assurances of peace which were given to the American people before the election.

But beyond the regulation of "execution privilege," and most urgent and important of all, Congress can and should proceed, through its appropriations power, to bring the war to an immediate end. Should it fail to do so, we may have to wait for the election of 1976 before the war can be ended. By that time, Mr. Nixon's indiscriminate terror bombing could well have destroyed North Vietnam as an organized society, while also inflicting incalculable injury upon our own society and institutions.

Mr. Nixon has, after 4 years, failed to end the war. He came to the brink of peace before the election but then, in the wake of the election, repudiated Mr. Kissinger's agreement. That agreement would have given the Thieu regime the reasonable chance for survival on which Mr. Nixon has insisted; it would have left Mr. Thieu with armed forces many times larger and far better equipped than the forces of his adversaries. But a "reasonable chance" is apparently not enough for President Thieu—or for President Nixon. They now insist upon a guarantee of the Saigon regime's predominance in South Vietnam—a predominance they have not been able to establish even with the help of an army of half a million Americans, or with the pulverizing power of Mr. Nixon's fleets of bombers.

Mr. Nixon has shown himself at the crucial moment unwilling to settle for a "reasonable chance" in the contest with Vietnamese communism. He still wants the victory and the submission of the enemy that have eluded two Presidents for 7 years.

The President's failure to end the war has now thrust the responsibility upon the shoulders of a Congress which has long struggled to escape it. But the responsibility is now inescapable. It is up to Congress, through its appropriations power, to end the war and to allow the North and South to settle the question of who rules Vietnam. That is the kind of peace Mr. Kissinger almost attained, and it must be recognized that an essential element to such an agreement is that it might result eventually in a Communist South Vietnam, although we hope it will not. If the Thieu regime is capable of marshaling its superior resources, it will spiring the loyalty of its people, it will prevail without further American participation. But if it cannot, the Vietcong will prevail. That is the meaning—the only possible meaning—of a "reasonable chance."

For several decades American Presidents have made war as they saw fit because Congress seemed incapable of asserting its constitutional war power. Now, in an ironic twist of events, the President seems incapable of making peace and it is up to Congress to fill the void. It is a considerable responsibility, but it cannot be avoided. If Congress does not now accept responsibility for ending the war, then it must share in full measure with Mr. Nixon the responsibility for perpetuating it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD certain letters which I have received showing the intense dismay of our fellow citizens with the renewal of the war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the December 29, 1972, issue of Worldwide Treatment of Current Issues. This press summary of world reaction to Mr. Nixon's recent bombing campaign shows a predominant attitude of revulsion on the part of America's friends and allies as well as other countries. A characteristic reaction was that of the Times of London, which spoke of a "revulsion of feeling across the world."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATHENS, OHIO,
December 22, 1972.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: May I express to you my full support for your efforts to attain peace in Viet Nam. The resumption of bombing of Hanoi at this time when all Americans have been led to believe that peace is close at hand dangerously erodes our confidence in our own government. These bombing raids senselessly kill Vietnamese civilians, take us further away from the objective of peace and endanger the lives of our own prisoners of war. Could any action be more irrational and irresponsible at this time?

Millions of taxpayer dollars are diverted from the goal of solving internal American problems for the support of this unpopular and immoral and murderous war. We have lost this war already and need no longer seek to save "honor." The continuation of bombing attacks now undermines support for American goals all over the world. We stand condemned in world opinion all over the civilized world.

Our only hope is that the U.S. Senate and the Congress will put an end to financial support of this new and demented escalation. The American electorate has been promised that peace was in sight and President Nixon has been reelected on the basis of peace hopes. These hopes are now dashed anew. It is the legislative branch of our government that must now act.

I urge that the Senate act now and with new aggressiveness to obtain for us the peace that Mr. Kissinger had within his reach and lost.

Yours sincerely,

JOSEPH M. BURNS,
Ohio University.

SALEM, VA.,
December 20, 1972.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: We believe the current impasse in the secret negotiations between the United States and North Vietnam can be attributed directly to President Nixon. After eight years of inconclusive war in Southeast Asia in which the basic question has been sovereignty over South Vietnam, how can he now insist that this issue be settled in Paris in a manner favoring South Vietnam? After eight years of abortive negotiations, how can he accuse the North Vietnamese of being devious? To us the answer is naivete, monumental in the face of eight years of frustrating war or intransigence, monumental in the face of the fervent expectations of the American people.

Now, with the settlement "99% complete," Nixon orders the heaviest bombing raids in history—in defiance of the will of the American people and the conscience of civilization. Bombing has not and never can force the North Vietnamese to a negotiated settlement favoring South Vietnam. Nixon should have learned this by now, but in his frustration and anger bombing is the only response he knows.

Nixon is unable to settle this war. Congress must act quickly to this end before the faith of the American people in their leadership has completely disappeared, and before their concept of courage and humanity have been completely destroyed.

We are ready to support your efforts financially and otherwise to the extent of our capabilities.

Sincerely,

W. GLEN WILLIAMS.
ROSALIND H. WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
December 20, 1972.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On hearing today of the resumption of massive bombing of North Vietnam, I am overwhelmed with a helpless sense of moral degradation. The President's barbaric course of action outrages every sane and humane value of civilization and brands us as a nation of murderers. You, above all other legislators, must speak out louder and plainer and more insistently than ever before. The President's unconscionable disposition to violence must be decried and curbed—in the name of responsible Americans and humanity itself.

Sincerely and in extremis,

GILBERT FIELD.

ers are known to exercise tight ideological and organizational control over their members."

Finally, says Walt, Red China has not signed the 1961 single conventions on drugs. Consequently, it does not report to the U.N. on its licit opium agriculture, nor does it accept inspection of any kind, nor does it participate in any international drug control operations.

HOW SERIOUS IN THE DRUG PROBLEM?

How serious is the drug problem in the United States? Our heroin addict population, says Walt, is almost 10 times as large as it was in 1960, and almost twice as large as it was two or three years ago. The estimated 600,000 addicts we have are reportedly responsible for 50 to 60 per cent of our street crimes and petty burglary.

More than any other factor, it is the rise in addiction that has "converted our streets into dangerous jungles and our cities into places of fear, each addict requiring $50 a day to supply his habit." What America will be like three years hence if the number of addicts again doubles almost defies the imagination, says Walt.

Moreover, says Walt, drug addiction has all the attributes of a contagious disease because addicts are under an irresistible compulsion to hook others. Gen. Walt underscored this fact by including in his report a diagram drawn by British psychiatrist Rene de Alarcon, documenting how two addicts in the small British town of Crawley spread the sickness of heroin addiction to 56 other people over a period of five years.

"To be precise," said Walt, "Dr. De Alacron was able to establish that the two initial addicts were directly responsible for initiating another 46 young people into heroin addiction. The origins of the other 10 cases of addiction were not clearly traceable, but there is reason for believing that the existence of an addict community in Crawley played some role. . . . Now multiply the infectious circles in this diagram by roughly 10,000 and you will have some conception of the problem we are up against in America today."

Yet, says Walt, he believes the heroin epidemic can be halted through the use of a combination of domestic and international measures, including sophisticated spy satellites, trained drug fighters, tougher laws and diplomatic pressures.

While some believe that the drug problem stems from ills in society and cannot be stopped by merely reducing the drug supply, Walt takes sharp exception to that theory. "Everything we learned on this trip," says Walt, "points in the opposite direction—it points to the conclusion that availability of drugs is a decisive factor, that availability can be controlled, and that, were it controlled, the rate of addiction is automatically limited."

The GI's in Korea are basically the same GI's we have in Viet Nam, argues Walt. They come from the same, broad cross-section of society and they have, by and large, the same strong points and the same complex of weaknesses. Yet in Viet Nam our forces were caught up in a "massive heroin epidemic" when high-grade heroin became suddenly available at $1 a vial. This "saturation attack," Walt explained, "succeeded for the simple reason that no one had foreseen it and neither the South Vietnamese government nor our own armed forces had erected any defenses that might have dammed the influx as it got started."

In South Korea, by way of contrast, heroin is not readily available because the South Korean government enforces its anti-narcotics laws in a stringent manner. In consequence, the heroin addiction has been kept at a very low level among our armed forces there.

Mainland China and other totalitarian countries, notes Walt, have no problem in controlling addiction because of the Draconian manner in which they enforce their laws. Addiction is also effectively controlled in authoritarian governments like Taiwan and South Korea.

"Most important of all from our own standpoint," says Walt, "is the Japanese example, because the Japanese have shown that it is possible to roll back a far-advanced epidemic within the framework of a highly Democratic society. This they succeeded in doing by tough laws, rigorous enforcement and heavy penalties. Their success is all the more striking because their high standard of living would under ordinary circumstances, make their country a prime target for the international drug traffickers."

HEROIN TRAFFICKERS AIDED BY LAX LAW ENFORCEMENT

To explain why we are having so much trouble combatting dope pushers, Walt introduced some interesting charts dealing with the handling of narcotics offenders in New York City from Jan. 1, 1969, through Oct. 31, 1971. These charts dealt with Class "A" felonies; i.e., felonies involving more than 16 ounces of heroin. Sixteen ounces have a street value in New York of about $170,000 and is enough for about 20,000 injections.

In the first chart unveiled by Walt, more than 20 per cent of those arrested had been arrested *a minimum of 10 times previously*, that over 50 per cent had been arrested at least seven times previously, and that almost 5.1 per cent had been arrested over 18 times previously. Many of these previous arrests were also on narcotics charges.

The second chart showed the sentences handed down in Class "A" drug indictments. Nearly 40 per cent—38.1 per cent to be precise—got off with less than 10 years. With parole and good behavior, most of those with sentences of less than five years can be out on the streets again in two years or less.

Yet this is only part of the story, says Walt. Major traffickers about whose guilt there was absoutely no shadow of a doubt have been acquitted on the "basis of technicalities which would not be honored by any court in any other civilized country. Many more have skipped bail, even when the bail has been set as high as $50,000 and $100,000. And, among the smaller offenders, many have never been brought to trial, while many others have gotten off with suspended sentences."

END THE WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the time for debate on the merits of the war in Vietnam is past. The war has been debated for the last 7 years and has been shown to be without merit from the standpoint of American security and national interest.

By the time of the 1972 election, only 2 months ago, Mr. Nixon seemed to have accepted the war's futility. He assured us, through his closest adviser, that peace was "at hand." The President himself told Garnett Horner of the Star in an interview given on November 5 and published on November 9:

> Let me tell you this on Vietnam—when I tell you I am completely confident that we are going to have a settlement, you can bank on it.

On election eve, November 6, 1972, President Nixon assured the American people that, despite remaining "details,"—

I can say to you with complete confidence tonight that we will soon reach agreement on all the issues and bring this long and difficult war to an end.

Once again Mr. Nixon has betrayed the promise of peace, just as he betrayed it after his election in 1968, and just as it was betrayed after the election of 1964.

Owing to the secretiveness of the administration, we do not know exactly what went wrong with the October agreement. But by available evidence the President, after the election, changed his terms of peace, which had been agreed upon in October, not just in technical detail but in the very substance of the agreement. He did this, apparently, by demanding North Vietnam's recognition in some form of the Thieu regime's "sovereignty" in South Vietnam. This in effect would require North Vietnam to disown the Vietcong, which also claims "sovereignty" in South Vietnam. That indeed is what the war has been about: who is to be sovereign in South Vietnam. The October agreement left this undetermined, just as the war itself had left it undetermined. That very imprecision made agreement possible. Now Mr. Nixon seeks to pin down in an agreement what has not been won in the war: the right of the Thieu regime to perpetuate its rule in South Vietnam.

In order to compel North Vietnam to acquiesce in these substantially—radically—altered demands, as against the October agreement, Mr. Nixon launched a campaign of unprecedented terror bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. In so doing, he has taken the lives of hundreds, more likely thousands, of Vietnamese civilians, and he has created many new American prisoners-of-war, while losing B–52 bombers for the first time in the war, and losing them at a prodigal rate. Now, once again, he has stopped the terror bombing—at least temporarily—announced the resumption of peace talks, and urged the Congress to remain silent, uncomplaining, and uninformed, on pain of being held responsible for disrupting the peace talks.

The time for debate—and for delay—is past. The administration promised peace but failed to produce it. Unless the October agreement—or some agreement—is signed within the next few days, surely no later than the inauguration, it will be the Congress' responsibility to take immediate action to end the war by cutting off funds for its prosecution. The Senate voted to do that twice last summer, but those efforts were aborted, largely to allow the administration the opportunity to prove the effectiveness of its strategy for peace. If, as now appears quite possible, that strategy has collapsed, it is Congress' responsibility to deliver on the electoral promise which Mr. Nixon seems now, for the second time, to have betrayed. That, indeed, is the consensus of the Foreign Relations Committee, which agreed on January 2 that if a peace agreement is not reached by inauguration day, January 20, it will then become Congress' duty to employ the legislative process to bring the war to an immediate end.

Congress has the authority as well as the responsibility to end the war. At the

several of the commission's basic assumptions were in error."

Among the many officials of foreign governments with whom Walt and his staff discussed the Shafer report, not a single one "shared the tolerant attitude of the Shafer Commission toward cannabis. In Japan, France and other countries we were told that the Shafer Commission report had caused consternation in the ranks of those concerned with the problem of drug control, and that it seriously undercut their efforts to combat the growing use of marijuana in their own countries."

In several countries, Walt added, embassy personnel stated that when the Shafer Commission team visited them, it seemed apparent that the team's mind was already made up and that it was seeking confirmation for a preconceived point of view.

Walt said he was particularly surprised that the Shafer team, in the course of its foreign travels, did not once take the time to check in with Dr. Braenden. Dr. Braenden's U.N. office, Walt remarked, is a clearing house for some 30 laboratories working on heroin and marijuana research.

Thus, said Walt, it is difficult to accept the Shafer report as "gospel." Perhaps, suggested the retired Marine general, far more research should be made into the effects of cannabis before we embark on the radical course of legalizing marijuana as advocated by the Shafer Commission.

MORE ON RED INVOLVEMENT IN WORLDWIDE DRUG TRAFFIC

While Gen. Walt makes the point that the world drug traffic is primarily a criminal phenomenon, he also emphasizes that the evidence is clear that Communists in various parts of the world have been involved in the drug traffic in significant ways. "In fact," he adds, "I find it impossible to understand how our media can ignore the clear evidence of Communist involvement while exaggerating out of all proportion the charge that corruption among our Southeast Asian allies is the primary cause of the drug epidemic in our country."

The evidence taken by the Eastland subcommittee, he pointed out, established that in one of the largest heroin smuggling cases on record, Manuel Dominguez Suárez, one-time head of the Mexican Federal Judicial Police, made nine trips to East Berlin, each time returning to Mexico with 50 kilograms of heroin—which was then moved across the border into the United States. Since Suárez was able in each case to enter East Berlin without having his passport stamped, said Walt, "it is clear that elements of the East German secret police must have been involved."

There is also the remarkable case of Squella-Avendano. A prominent supporter of Chile's Marxist president, Salvador Allende, Squella-Avendano was arrested in Miami on July 27, 1970, for transporting 203 pounds of Chilean cocaine, worth $10 million. This was the largest cocaine seizure to date. At his trial, Squella said he had been slated to receive an important post in the Allende government.

"He was," said Walt, "obviously a very important man to the Communist network in the Western Hemisphere, because hard on the heels of his arrest, the U.S. attorney in charge of the case was approached with the bizarre proposition that Squella be exchanged for four American hijackers then in Cuba." The offer was subsequently expanded to include the master of the "Johnny Express," the Miami-based ship seized on the high seas last December by Castro's navy. Since then, there have been repeated articles in the pro-Communist press in Chile, hailing Squella as a national hero and a victim of American imperialism.

In Southeast Asia, Walt stated, the Communists are up to their ears in the dope traffic. In Laos, he pointed out, the Communists occupy some 80 to 90 per cent of the opium-growing areas. In Thailand, the Communist-led guerrillas control an important stretch of opium-producing land along the Laotian frontier. In both Thailand and Laos, the villages where the opium is grown are under the thumb of manager-cadres, trained in Peking and Hanoi. Both movements are armed to a large degree with Chinese weapons, and both have their major radio propaganda operations based in Chinese territory. The money made from selling opium is used to support the insurgency operations.

Communist elements, Walt elaborated, also play a vital role in the Burma drug situation. Burma is the single most important factor in the Southeast Asia situation, for here is where most of the opium is grown and here is where most of the refineries and traffickers are concentrated.

All of the armed groups in Burma, both pro-Communist and anti-Communist, have been involved in the drug trade. But the area which the Communists control east of the Salween River is reputed to be the most fertile opium-producing territory in the whole of Burma, and is credited with some 25 per cent of Burma's total production.

"Burma's production," explained Walt, "is estimated at some 400 tons a year, but the tribesmen use most of it for themselves, exporting only some 100 to 150 tons. Because it produces the largest surplus of any area in Burma, the territory under Communist control may be responsible for as much as 40 to 50 per cent of Burma's entire opium export."

In view of the fact that Peking mothered the White Flag Communist insurgency in Burma and that it still controls them, said Walt, "it cannot escape moral responsibility for their role as prime producers in the opium traffic."

HOW DEEPLY IS RED CHINA IMPLICATED?

Gen. Walt would not draw any firm conclusions about Red China's possible involvement in the drug trade, but he suggested there is strong circumstantial evidence that such is the case. Further, he makes it clear that suspicion is quite rightly thrown on the mainland, at least until it takes positive steps to comply with international protocol and conventions designed to stop illegal trafficking in narcotics. The facts pointing to Red China's involvement, said Walt, are these:

The official U.S. position today is that we have no evidence that opium or opiates are coming out of Red China into the world markets, but the possibility is not excluded that certain tribal elements in the China-Burma border area may be moving small quantities of opium across the border illegally.

It was conceded by everyone Walt and his staff spoke to that there is substantial opium agriculture in China for medicinal purposes, at least several hundred tons, possibly as much as 800 to 1,000 tons a year. Estimates are, however, that in every country, perhaps 10 per cent of the total output escapes into the illicit market, even when that country is hard at work cracking down on traffickers. Thus, Walt hints, even if Red China is not deliberately selling opium on the world market, it is quite possible that 80 to 100 tons of opium grown on the mainland find its way into the international drug trade.

There can be no question, said Walt, that large quantities of opium were coming out of China in the 1950s and early 1960s. The reports which the United States and the British government filed with the United Nations made this charge year after year, much of it buttressed by hard items of evidence. The report filed with the U.N. in 1962, for instance, described in-depth interviews which a senior American narcotics agent had gathered from three Yunnanese, one of whom had served as a mule skinner in a series of opium caravans moving from Yunnan into North Burma.

The report of the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs of May 14–June 1, 1962, summarized the evidence: "With reference to the question of the origin of opium in the Burma-Mainland China-Laos-Thailand border areas, information was reported by the representative of the United States concerning investigations carried out in recent months in cooperation with control authorities in the Far East. Three witnesses, former inhabitants of Yunnan Province in Mainland China, had made a detailed statement to United States Treasury Department officials on the cultivation of opium in Yunnan and its export from there to the Shan states of Burma.

"One witness had himself been a cultivator, and in 1953 and 1956 he had also, with his mules, joined caravans transporting opium to the Shan frontier, where he assisted in its transshipment into trucks for transport to a trading company at Kenlung, Burma. Two caravans, of 108 and 82 mules, had transported over four and three tons respectively, two sealed tins of 20 KG being carried by each mule.

"The cultivator estimated that some six tons of opium had been produced annually in the area where he lived, and that the total production of the region in 1961 had been of the order of 1,000 tons."

The director of British customs in Hong Kong told Walt that he and his staff had no evidence that opiates were coming from the mainland. But he also acknowledged that they were not looking for evidence—that, for political reasons, they do not search ships or cargo coming out of Mainland China. Walt argues that the British administration is not at fault here, because Hong Kong is in such a precarious position that the British just can't risk a confrontation with China. An identical situation, says Walt, prevails in Portuguese Macao.

What this adds up to, said Walt, is that "we have no way of knowing whether illicit opiates are coming out of China at these two critical points. The Peking government may be scrupulously honest about the ships and cargoes that travel to and through Hong Kong and Macao. All of her ship's masters and crewmen may also be scrupulously honest. But because her attitude makes inspection impossible, we simply have no way of knowing.

"China's ability to move contraband through Hong Kong and Macao—if she is disposed to do so—is further enhanced by the fact that a large number of ships of Hong Kong registry are operated by companies known to be controlled by the Peking government. . . .

"If China wishes to allay world suspicion, it is not too much to ask that it drop its objection to having ships and cargoes originating in China subjected to search by British or Portuguese or other customs officials. Every civilized nation in the world recognizes that other nations must have the right to inspect ships and cargo sailing under their flag in order to protect themselves against traffic in contraband of various kinds.

"If China is to become a fully cooperating member of the community of nations, she must abandon the attitude which at this point assures her ships and cargoes of privileges not accorded by any other nation."

Increasing numbers of Chinese seamen, many of them based in Hong Kong, are being apprehended in the United States and Britain with quantities of heroin. In the case of the Hong Kong seamen, Walt points out, "virtually all of them are members of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union, which is completely controlled by pro-Peking Communists.

"I want to emphasize that there is no evidence that the union, as such, is involved in narcotics smuggling. But the large number of Hong Kong seamen involved in the traffic does raise some questions, especially in view of the fact that the Communist lead-

only publication to give them due attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles from Human Events on the press blackout on the drug hearings be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY PRESS BLACKOUT ON DRUG HEARING?

Sen. James Eastland's (D.-Miss.) Senate Internal Security subcommittee has just finished holding some remarkable hearings on the worldwide narcotics traffic, but for some curious reason the media have failed to give them extensive coverage. The topic of the subcommittee's probe was clearly provocative and newsworthy, while the witnesses, including former Marine Gen. Lewis Walt and Dr. Olav J. Braenden, director of the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory, had a certain star quality about them.

The information divulged at the hearings was strikingly new in some instances, and could still have a significant impact on the way the Administration, the Congress and the public view how to handle the drug problem here at home. Yet the newspapers and the TV gave short shrift to the subcommittee's work.

The hearings produced evidence that the dissemination of drugs in the United States could probably be brought under control if we were less lax in meting out stiff penalties to drug pushers. Indeed, the subcommittee not only revealed the astonishingly light sentences dished out to hard-core peddlers in this country, where drugs are a persistent and serious problem, but showed that in Japan the government crushed a near drug epidemic through swift and stern punishment for the pushers.

Moreover, both Gen. Walt and Dr. Braenden testified as to the dangers inherent in marijuana, with Walt taking direct issue with the government-appointed Shafer Commission and its rather casual attitude toward the use of pot.

In addition, Gen. Walt testified that our Southeast Asian allies—contrary to many sensationalized press reports—have been actively cooperating with the U.S. in stamping out the international drug trade. Walt also extensively dealt with Communist involvement in this trade, and pointed an accusatory finger at Red China for doing virtually nothing to allay strong circumstantial evidence that it is conspiring to sell heroin on the world market.

Further, Gen. Walt, who travelled to Europe and Asia for the subcommittee to gather first-hand knowledge about the international drug market, prepared a 102-page report on his findings and recommendations, a copy of which can be obtained from the subcommittee. Yet save for a few scattered and incomplete news stories, the media, which have avidly published stories on narcotics at variance with Walt's findings, wasted few words on Walt's detailed report or the hearings themselves.

But both, we suggest, produced some extremely important information, information that could prove enormously helpful in combatting the serious drug problem facing this country. Why the press chose to pretty much ignore the subcommittee's drug probe might be a proper subject for Accuracy in Media (AIM) to pursue, since AIM seems to be one of the few organizations that can persuade the media to correct errors and to publish overlooked news stories. (See story on AIM, page 6.)

Meanwhile, we will highlight some of the testimony and findings of Eastland's subcommittee ourselves.

HOW JAPAN SOLVED ITS DRUG PROBLEM

In his 102-page report to the Senate Internal Security subcommittee, Gen. Walt came up with various recommendations on how to combat the drug problem existing in this country. He called for the use of a new, sophisticated reconnaissance satellite to pinpoint opium production around the world, an increase in funds for Interpol, which keeps dossiers on international criminals, and additional manpower and funds for the U.S. domestic agencies engaged in the war on narcotics.

But equally important, Walt, judging from the way in which other countries have managed to lick the drub problem, advocated far tougher laws. He believes, for instance, that there should be no bail for traffickers guilty of Class "A" felonies, involving the dissemination of 16 ounces or more of heroin. He also advocates mandatory minimum sentences for Class "A" offenders.

In addition, Walt thinks that capital punishment should be added to the range of options open to the courts for imposing sentence on major traffickers. Finally, he thinks the courts must mete out punishment swiftly, and he would establish a special court system to ensure that this could be accomplished.

Walt stressed that he is for tougher laws because he found that in such countries as Taiwan, Thailand and Iran, where punishment is both severe and swift, the drug problem is under control. But it is in democratic Japan, he suggests, where the U.S. might find the solution for stopping the spread of heroin addiction.

In the late 1950s, Walt reported, Japan became aware that it was facing a serious drug problem. It was estimated that half-a-million Japanese were mainlining amphetamines and that some 40–50,000 had become heroin addicts. In 1960 over 2,000 cases involving illicit traffic in narcotics came before the Japanese courts.

The Japanese government began to move vigorously. It established a "Ministers' Council for Narcotics Countermeasures" and an "Anti-Narcotic Drug Headquarters," and two important amendments were attached to the 1963 narcotics control law. The first increased the maximum term of imprisonment for traffickers from 10 years to life imprisonment. The second amendment set up a system of compulsory hospitalization, plus follow-up counseling, for drug addicts.

Stated Walt: "In six years time, Japan had virtually liquidated its heroin addiction problem. By 1969 the total number of addicts was down to 6,008—of whom 98 per cent had been addicted to medicinal narcotics under medical treatment. The number of new heroin addicts reported each year fell from 1,731 in 1961 and 1,072 in 1963, to 10 in 1968 and three in 1969."

Moreover, said Walt, the stiffer penalties under the amended law unquestionably played a role in enabling the Japanese to liquidate their epidemic. "More important," he added, "was the rigorous manner in which they enforced the anti-narcotics law and the remarkable—but controlled—latitude accorded to the Japanese police in developing their investigations."

Under Japanese law, an arrested person can be detained and interrogated for a minimum of 48 hours without attorney or bail. The police may then get a court order authorizing them to continue the interrogation for another 10 days. In addition, they may ask for another court order, giving them a second 10 days. So narcotics suspects may be detained a total of 22 days without access to a lawyer.

Walt stressed that American Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs agents who have sat in on some of these interrogations say that the Japanese police do not deny their prisoners sleep or brutalize them. They say that the interrogations are conducted in a civilized and highly sophisticated manner.

"But by the time the Japanese police have completed their 22 days of interrogation," Walt told the subcommittee, "they have generally wrung the prisoners dry of all the information they possess concerning confederates, associates, and the narcotics traffic in general. And when it comes to combatting the narcotics traffickers, obtaining this kind of information is 90 per cent of the game of law enforcement.

"This, in a nutshell, is why Japan has no heroin addiction problem, and why the traffickers stay away from Japan, even though her high standard of living would make Japan a lucrative market."

SHOULD MARIJUANA BE LEGALIZED?

Dr. Olav J. Braenden, director of the United Nations Narcotics Laboratory, was another key witness before the Eastland subcommittee, but his conclusions on cannabis (the marijuana plant) were also given scant attention by the press. Dr. Braenden has been head of the laboratory since its founding 16 years ago. For the past six years, under instructions from the U.N.'s Division of Narcotics Drugs, he has made cannabis research a top priority.

Cannabis is the scientific name for the marijuana plant. Ordinary marijuana comes from the leaves of the plant, while hashish, nearly five times as concentrated as marijuana, is derived from the resin of the plant.

Before testifying, said Dr. Braenden, he had contacted a number of scientists in different countries who have been collaborating on various aspects of cannabis research. Dr. Braenden conversed with Prof. W.D.M. Paton of Oxford University; Dr. Ole Rafaelsen of Denmark; Prof. C. Miras of the University of Athens, and with Prof. Cornelius Salamink of the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands.

"Among the scientists working in the field," Dr. Braenden told the subcommittee, "it would seem that there is a general consensus that cannabis is dangerous—opinions differ, however, on the degree of the danger to the individual and to society. In my opinion, it seems that, as progressively more scientific facts are discovered about cannabis, the more one becomes aware of its potential dangers."

Dr. Braenden says there is evidence that, with repeated use, cannabis tends to build up in the body tissue. Moreover, there may be considerable impairment in driving ability after oral ingestion of cannabis, and rat experiments have resulted in a very high percentage of birth abnormalities.

Even more alarming, Dr. Braenden testified that Dr. A.M. Campbell and his colleagues of the Bristol Royal United Hospital have found "significant evidence of cerebral atrophy in young smokers."

In spite of the progress made in recent years in cannabis research, Dr. Braenden added, much still remains to be done before there is an adequate understanding of the nature and effects of this complex plant.

Addressing himself to the subject of marijuana, Gen. Walt said he disagreed sharply with the government's commission on marijuana—the Shafer Commission—which, in effect, recommended the legalization of cannabis for personal use and for distribution in small quantities. Gen. Walt says he agrees with the commission's belief that youthful marijuana smokers should not be sentenced to several years in prison, but he still favors fining smokers by way of "underscoring the point that marijuana smoking does damage to society."

In his own investigation into the subject, said Walt, "we are now of the opinion that

Kantrowitz said Clemente had devoted himself to making aid available to Managua's earthquake victims.

"He was putting 14 hours a day just working with his committee," Kantrowitz said. "As a matter of fact, when I brought him some food to eat, he wouldn't stop to eat it."

Clemente had made appeals on radio and television for food, clothing and drugs, Kantrowitz said.

Himself a state campaign chairman for the March of Dimes for five years, Kantrowitz called the response "unbelievable" as donations came "in carloads" to Hi Bithorn Stadium, San Juan, used as a depot to store and package goods headed for Managua.

"The stadium parking lot was almost as filled as when there's a ballgame. There was enough food and clothing to fill Three Rivers Stadium, sections A and B, on the outside perimeter of the stadium."

"People came down there with Christmas gifts which had been unopened," Mrs. Kantrowitz said.

"As great a ballplayer as he was," Kantrowitz said, "he was a greater human being. In spite of his earnings, in spite of everything else, he was a down-to-earth human being who would spend as much time talking with the common man as he would with a captain of industry."

Clemente was a family man devoted to his children, his "adopted" Pittsburgh "parents" said.

"The public will never know what a family man he was for his children," Mrs. Kantrowitz said. "He adored those kids. Those children adored him. Seeing him alone with them feeding them . . . is unbelievable.

"One day last week," she continued, "he looked at his oldest son and he said that Roberto Jr. would be the next Pittsburgh Pirates' rightfielder. 'Robertito' plays ball like his father—he stands like his father."

The Clemente household was an open house to nearly any Pittsburgher who visited San Juan.

Rabbi and Mrs. Moshe Goldblum yesterday recalled a recent visit with the Clemente family after an introduction before a game at Three Rivers Stadium.

EDWIN A. FITZHUGH, ONE OF ARIZONA'S OUTSTANDING JOURNALISTS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to report the death on December 3, 1972, of Mr. Edwin A. Fitzhugh, one of Arizona's outstanding journalists.

Mr. Fitzhugh, editor of the Phoenix Gazette for the past 14 years, died in St. Joseph's Hospital in Phoenix following an illness of several weeks. He was 63.

Mr. Eugene C. Pullman, publisher of the Phoenix Gazette and the Arizona Republic, said of editor Fitzhugh:

Fitz, whose association with our organization dates back more than 40 years, always had been first and foremost a newspaperman. His only other interest was in the outdoors, and there he had a powerful love for all that nature provided—the animals, the wilderness.

Fitzhugh had a code for life which he felt should be followed by politicians, professional people, business people and just people generally. He believed strongly that everyone should receive a fair deal, a square deal, an equal deal. His comments in carrying out this philosophy created a good deal of controversy at times, but he seldom was wrong.

At the time of his passing, I said:

Ed Fitzhugh has left a legacy for new generations of journalists to emulate. As a writer and editor, his creed was fairness and from this stance he devoted a lifetime to the highest principles of journalism.

I have lost a good friend and the free press has seen the passing of one of its staunchest advocates and ablest defenders.

Mr. Fitzhugh was a conservative in his philosophy, and in recent years his editorials on constitutional law had been used for classroom study at Harvard Law School and were made the subject of a national symposium at the University of Notre Dame.

Mr. Harry Montgomery, retired associate publisher of the Phoenix Gazette and the Arizona Republic, delivered the eulogy of Mr. Fitzhugh at memorial services on December 6.

It was a beautiful tribute to Mr. Fitzhugh and the things he stood for during a lifetime as a newspaperman, and I ask that the eulogy be printed in the RECORD, along with editorials written by his longtime associates, Mr. Don C. Urry of the Phoenix Gazette and Mr. Frederic S. Marquardt of the Arizona Republic.

There being no objection, the eulogy and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWIN A. FITZHUGH

(By Harry Montgomery)

We are here today to *honor* a friend, an associate and a newspaper man of tremendous dedication and integrity.

We call it a memorial service because he is not here.

The word *honor* is used advisedly. If we dared come here to mourn or to eulogize and it were within Ed Fitzhugh's power to do so, he would smite us all. He didn't like that kind of thing.

But we pay him honor for his good qualities, his services to the society in which he lived, and for his accomplishments as an individual and a newspaper man.

The brief tribute which is my assignment will be woven around a simple sentence in Don Urry's editorial in The Phoenix Gazette Monday:

"In an era of submissiveness, he was a fighter for what he held to be right."

There is no better, more succinct way to describe Edwin A. Fitzhugh, the man who was editor of The Phoenix Gazette for 14 years, than the statement: "He was a fighter for what he held to be right."

The editor of The Arizona Republic, Fritz Marquardt, looking at Ed through the eyes of the opposition, put it in a different way in his editorial Tuesday morning. "I'm very competitive," he quoted Fitzhugh as saying in summing up his attitude toward life. Then Marquardt added: "That was an understatement." The Republic editor was speaking from 14 years of bumping heads with his counterpart on The Gazette.

Anyone reading Fitzhugh's hard-hitting editorials and columns easily could conclude that he was out to prove the old saw that "The pen is mightier than the sword." Born to a pioneer ranching family he possessed the instincts attributed to early settlers who fought to protect their possessions. But Fitz fought with words that he pounded from his typewriter, and he fought for all mankind.

His publisher, Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, said of Fitz: "He had a code for life which he felt should be followed by politicians, professional people, business people, and just people generally. He believed strongly that everyone should receive a fair deal, a square deal, an equal deal. His comments in carrying out his philosophy created controversy at times, but he seldom was wrong."

No one ever heard of Fitzhugh giving in without a fight. Yet Marquardt said in The Republic that after Fitz had argued his point, "he knew how to concede graciously if he became convinced he was wrong." One of Fitzhugh's associates on The Gazette, Larry Ferguson, relates that he once saw the editor, well along in the writing of an editorial, tear the copy from the typewriter and toss it away. Larry asked for an explanation and Fitzhugh replied quietly, "I discovered half-way through that I was wrong."

One cause which commanded Fitzhugh's eternal vigilance was the freedom of man. He valued freedom above all else and made a career of championing rights of the individual. He could not bear the thought that freedoms established by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights were being eroded through permissiveness of government and society.

Jay Brashear, a Gazette editorial writer who had worked with Fitz longer than anyone except Don Urry, saw this as his "consuming devotion."

"To Ed Fitzhugh," Jay said, "the great truth was that man was created to be free. He gave all that he had every day of his life to preserve that essential quality of human existence, recognizing all the while that man through his own labors must earn the right to remain free.

"Ed didn't think of freedom as so many people do, in an abstract way. Freedom, as he saw it, was tangible—something that could be touched and savored and, above all, something precious and necessary for survival.

"With that single thought guiding him, he approached life with a special sensitivity few men possess. As he hiked through the splendors of Arizona nature—one of his favorite pastimes—it was more than exercise and enjoyment of the landscape. He was making his way as a free man—through the freedom explicit in nature and the Creation."

Next to his devotion to newspaper work, Fitzhugh loved the outdoors. He was a conservationist before it ever occurred to most of us that without it there will be no wilderness, no unpolluted streams, no forests to pass on to future generations. He recognized no grandeur except that of the Arizona landscape. His family (his wife Meryal, daughter, Meri-le (Mrs. Robert Collum) and son, Lee) shared his interest in the outdoors. Lee is now teaching forestry at Northern Arizona University.

When Fitz was not jousting with some branch of government or some development that he did not believe was in the public interest, he wrote a homespun-type column that often dealt with nature and the outdoors. Those who read his editorials only may have looked upon him as a perpetually angry man. But for contrast listen to this paragraph from one of his columns dealing with unchanging nature:

"The sky looked the same if you tipped your head way back and looked straight up between the pines. The clouds came over the same way, holding their meetings mostly in the afternoons to decide whether in the White Mountains to rain today. They clapped their hands in thunder to worry fishermen caught far from camp, even if they didn't intend to rain on that particular gaggle of humans that day."

His column, "Close to Home", revealed his love for the simple things of life. He began writing it in El Centro, Calif. and it maintained an almost rural flavor even after it was syndicated by the Chicago Sun-Times and was sold to some of the nation's largest newspaper. In its earlier years it dealt with problems that the man on the street or the family next door could associate with, and it was not until Fitz returned to Phoenix and his son and daughter began approaching maturity that it became more political and philosophical. In that column file can be found some of his finest writing.

Because of my interest in the preservation of Arizona history, Fitz often chided me that the Arizona Historical Society was concerning itself with the restoration of old residences in Tucson, Yuma, Prescott, etc., when in his opinion the real Arizona history was to be

found in prospectors' camps or pioneer ranch cabins.

These many facets of Fitzhugh caused some of his associates to look upon him as a complex man. Larry Ferguson described him as "a study in contrasts."

"He was kind, gentle, compassionate and understanding," Larry said. Yet at times he could be (so) demanding (he was) impossible to live with or work for. * * * You see, he was a perfectionist.

"He demanded perfection of himself. He demanded it of others. To work for Fitz was to search for Utopia. It never quite came off to his satisfaction, but * * * tomorrow maybe, or the next day, The Gazette's editorial pages would be perfect in every way."

This viewpoint also was expressed by Bert Whitman, Gazette cartoonist, who considered Fitz as "the best, toughest, hardest-hitting editor I ever had. He was also the most stimulating. He caused me to work twice as hard on a cartoon as I had ever done in 35 years of cartooning."

Fitz' demand for the best in everyone led a colleague at The Gazette to remark upon his death:

"The fire that some of us felt burned too hot at times has gone out and now it may seem to be terribly, terribly cold."

If Fitz was demanding on those who worked with him, all agree that he demanded more of himself. He firmly believed that every man should do whatever he was expected to do.

His final day at the office was indicative of his sense of responsibility. His last editorial was removed from the typewriter within the hour of his departure for the hospital where he was to seek relief from back and leg pains.

At the time he became ill he was writing the report of a committee appointed to evaluate the Arizona Academy's Town Halls. He wrote final changes, painfully and laboriously, in long hand from his hospital bed.

In intensive care two days after lung surgery he marked an absentee ballot in the November 7 general election. Didn't he believe that every good citizen should vote?

Ed Fitzhugh was a native of Phoenix, the son of a native Arizonan. His paternal grandfather came to the state as a boy in 1847.

Fitz was first introduced to journalism at Phoenix Union High School where his associates included Gov. Jack Williams, Reg Manning, Republic cartoonist, and Jack Lefler, Wall Street columnist for The Associated Press. He had hoped to be a cartoonist when he came to work for The Phoenix Gazette, but he turned to sports and became sports editor before leaving for California at the age of 20.

He worked for the old San Francisco News, the Sacramento Bee, and the Los Angeles Examiner before settling down for 20 years at El Centro where he became an editor and columnist and at one time published his own weekly.

In 1951 he became editor of the Chicago syndicate which already was selling his column. Five years later he went on to write editorials for the Indianapolis Star, and 14 years ago he returned to his beloved Arizona, the city of his birth, and his first newspaper. His experience had been as varied as his talents.

Some on The Gazette, paraphrasing, remarked the other day that Fitz had gone on to work for that big newspaper in the sky. You can just bet that by the time we catch up with him he will be working to improve it.

[From the Phoenix Gazette, Dec. 4, 1972]

EDWIN A. FITZHUGH

(By Don C. Urry)

Only seven weeks ago Ed Fitzhugh sat in the chair from which, as editor of The Phoenix Gazette for the past 14 years, he had written his outspoken and competent editorials and his always perceptive, often beautifully sensitive column, "Close to Home." The chair is empty, the office is dark. An outstanding editor has left the American scene, and to those of us who knew him well his loyalty and his pride in journalistic excellence will long be missed.

The list of his accomplishments in newspaper work is both varied and distinguished. His many years of extensive reporting—even as editor he never forgot that the life-blood of a newspaper is good reporting—ranged from some of the nation's most famous trials to the national political conventions and foreign affairs. He had been a syndicate editor, the publisher of his own weekly in California an editorial writer for The Indianapolis Star. He cherished the thought in 1958 of returning to Phoenix, his birthplace, as editor of The Gazette, the paper where he had started some 30 years earlier as cub and later as sports editor.

Through his whole career ran the thread of intense striving to bring out the best in himself and in the work of others. His high talent as a writer and his self-discipline combined to make him a most facile producer of readable, incisive newspaper copy. He could be hard-hitting and he could be gentle. He could dispose trenchantly of a public issue that aroused his anger, and in the next hour he could write a column that sensitively balanced the ideological aberrations of Charlie Chaplin with the great comedian's genius as an entertainer.

He found time to become exceptionally well versed in constitutional law and in the history of Communist subversion in this country. Aside from his professional work he contributed to his community through such activities as membership on the Community Council's board, the presidency of Friendly House, and participation in the executive planning of the Arizona Academy whose Town Halls often benefitted from his skill as a coordinator and analyzer of committee reports.

Away from the workaday world, Fitz was an enthusiastic outdoorsman with deep family and personal roots in the back country of Arizona, on which he was an expert. And the hands that could make a typewriter sing could also make wood carvings of rare beauty.

A sense of shock at an untimely loss saddens his colleagues. None who knew him could doubt his sincerity, nor fail to respect the firmness with which he held his beliefs. In an era of submissiveness, he was a fighter for what he held to be right. But he was also a friend whenever a friend was needed, whether it was a family in sickness or a disconsolate boy crouched on the street beside an injured dog. There have been too few like him.

[From the Arizona Republic, December 5, 1972]

"30" FOR A COLLEAGUE

(By Frederic S. Marquardt)

Ed Fitzhugh once summed up his attitude toward life in these words: "I'm very competitive."

As editor of The Phoenix Gazette, Fitz occasionally locked horns with members of his own staff, or with the editors of The Arizona Republic. His convictions ran deep.

When it came to making editorial policy he always knew what he believed and was able to argue his point. But he also knew how to concede graciously if he became convinced he was wrong.

As must happen between competing newspapers, there were times when we on The Republic did not see eye-to-eye with our opposite numbers on The Gazette. But we respected each other, and we knew there was room for more than one opinion on most questions.

Fitz died Sunday, after a bout with cancer and an operation from which there could be no recovery. It was typical of the man, however, that he spent five weeks in the recovery room before he went "gentle into that good night."

He was attracted to newspapers during his Phoenix Union High School days, spent with such luminaries as the Goldwaters, Jack Williams, Blanche Friedman Bernstein, and Reg Manning. He worked for newspapers in San Francisco and Indianapolis, edited a syndicate in Chicago and returned to Phoenix 14 years ago. In between he achieved the goal of every newspaperman—be edited and published a weekly newspaper.

That happened to be in El Centro, where he learned about the water problems facing both California and Arizona. He also learned about communism by covering a major trial of California Communists.

While newspapering was his vocation, the law and wildlife were his avocations. Fitz subscribed to a special service that brought U.S. Supreme Court decisions to his desk as soon as they were promulgated. He read them with more understanding than any lay editor we have ever known.

Fitz was a conservationist before it was the "in thing." He liked to hunt, but he liked the great out-of-doors even more, and many of his editorials testify to his determination to pass the wilderness on to future generations.

On the wall of his now quiet office there hangs a photo of a horse-drawn carriage on a dirt road in front of the Phoenix Enterprise which later was merged into the Arizona Gazette.

The photo was taken on Second Street in Phoenix in 1905, four years before Fitz was born. It was the old Phoenix that Ed Fitzhugh loved so well.

A life dedicated to making those old traditions mesh with modern times was not spent in vain.

PRESS BLACKOUT ON INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON DRUG TRAFFIC

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, late last fall the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member, held extensive hearings and published extensive staff studies on the worldwide narcotics problem. Key witnesses included such distinguished citizens as former Marine Gen. Lewis Walt and Dr. Olav J. Braenden, Director of the United Nations Laboratory. Despite a continual press campaign on the subject of narcotics—much of it aimed at loosening our narcotics laws—very little attention was paid by the press. Included in the hearings were authoritative statements by experts and many constructive suggestions such as General Walt's proposal to use satellite technology to monitor worldwide the fields of growing poppies. The hearings also showed that stricter narcotics laws are the answer to cleaning up the drug problem. Japan has led the way in this field and has virtually eliminated its own menacing addiction problem.

The hearings also underline the fact that Communist China refuses to cooperate with any worldwire monitoring system and opens itself to grave suspicion of complicity in the drug traffic. Although these hearings were quite extensive, they were very thoroughly summarized in brief by the Washington newspaper, Human Events, virtually the

THE WASHINGTON POST DATE 24 AUG 73 PAGE B19

U.S. Losing Drug-Smuggling War

By Jack Anderson and Les Whitten

The government's war against drug smuggling, trumpeted as one of the major domestic successes of the Nixon administration, is losing the battle to fleets of small private planes and fast boats.

Classified documents from the Customs Bureau made available to us demonstrate the extent of the government's failure. They flatly state that the narcotics agents cannot compete with the ingenuity of the smugglers.

The dope runners have organized the most important small boat operation since the evacuation of Dunkirk, and the government's fragmented narcotics forces are unable to cope with them.

"We must undertake a program to provide Customs control of small boat traffic entering the United States," one of the documents asserts. "Smuggling of narcotic drugs by small boats is a serious problem. At present, we have no means of effecting interdiction of drugs entering the United States by this means."

The high flying dope peddlers operate with equal freedom, hauling their cargo of white powder from Mexico and Canada with virtually no opposition.

"Smuggling by means of private aircraft has grown in a situation where control of this commerce, for technical reasons, was not possible," the documents said.

In short, the situation is so out of hand that Mafia and free-lance traffickers have virtual carte blanche to haul their wares across the United States borders.

Federal anti-narcotics officials have made elaborate plans to increase their efficiency in the air and on the water, but budget conscious bureaucrats have cut out this capability. For this fiscal year alone, the Office of Management and Budget has sliced the Customs budget for these plans from $11.4 million to $3.3 million.

This penny-wise policy is preventing narcotics agents from acquiring sophisticated tools, including aircraft with special tracking equipment, boats fast enough to catch smugglers' craft, and sensors to seek out the dope runners.

The drug fighters are using some electronic sensors borrowed from the military, but find them virtually worthless.

The heavily publicized seizures of millions of dollars worth of narcotics are largely the work of old-fashioned customs and narcotics agents at ports or elsewhere, based on leads from painstakingly nurtured informants. Arrests of smugglers through random checks of small planes or boats have been few and infrequent.

Presently, the air-sea fight against drugs is badly fragmented between Customs at the Treasury Department and the new Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) at the Justice Department. A memorandum describing a meeting last month between Customs' air intrusion coordinators and George Brosan, a top Customs enforcement official, makes clear that neither agency knows what the other is doing.

There are about 50 planes of various kinds available at any one time to the two agencies for air and boat surveillance. But without cooperation between them through use of informers who signal the departure of a shipment from some lonely harbor or airport, the planes are useless. They cannot "picket-line" the entire border.

DEA, which may wind up with the whole program eventually, is too busy reorganizing to take on any new duties, particularly ones as complicated as the "Air Intrusion" operation.

The overall mess is best summed up by Brosan:

"Both the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Immigration and Naturalization Service have token programs. Neither can compare with the present Customs effort, and possibly some thought ought to be given to combining the three programs."

CIA Pig-Sticker—The men who work for the Central Intelligence Agency are traditionally regarded as close-mouthed characters who spend their waking hours tracking spies and tapping telephones.

Angus MacLean Thuermer, the agency's "public information officer," defies tradition. He is one of the nation's foremost "pig stickers," and he doesn't mind talking about it.

He became addicted to the exotic sport of "pig sticking", nicely underpayed British nicely underpayed British term for hunting wild boar on horseback with a spear"—while serving with the Foreign Service in India

Last year, Thuermer went back to India for another hog hunt. When he returned to the States, he broke CIA tradition and published his memoirs of the hunt in an obscure weekly newspaper called the "Piedmont Virginian."

Although Thuermer rarely has anything to say to reporters about CIA affairs, he waxes poetic about pig sticking.

Footnote: So proud of his pig-sticking prowess is Thuermer that he keeps his spear in his office. He invited us over to see it, but we politely refused when he added that "it isn't every day that you get to stick an Anderson man."

THE WASHINGTON POST DATE Sep 73 PAGE 19

Asian Guerrillas Offer Opium Deal

By Jack Anderson

The colorful Shan guerrillas have offered to sell the United States most of the Southeast Asian opium crop and to wage war on any other opium convoys that may try to operate in the area. In exchange, they want $12 million in hard cash and a U.S. promise to help them win autonomy from Burma.

This astonishing proposal was made in writing by two top Shan leaders who sent an emissary down from the hills to meet clandestinely in Bangkok with Rep. Lester Wolff (D-N.Y.). As chairman of a House narcotics subcommittee, Wolff is the House's leading expert on Burma-Thailand-Laos opium production. He was in Bangkok last month on a survey with five other congressmen.

The signed Shan offer to destroy up to 400 tons of high-grade Asian opium, combined with the U.S.-sponsored crackdown on Turkish opium, theoretically could wipe out 75 per cent of the supply of heroin on America's streets. And $12 million admittedly would be cheaper than trying to stop the smuggling operation the hard way.

As Wolff recounts his dramatic encounter in Bangkok, the Shan emissary, an Englishman, arranged by letter and telephone to meet with him in a hotel lobby away from his congressional colleagues. A follow-up meeting was held in a nook off a bustling Bangkok street.

The Englishman handed him the two-page proposal signed by Gen. Law Hsin Han and Boon Tai, the two rebel leaders, who also sent as evidence of good faith a handwritten list of all recent opium shipments by mule, backpack and trucks with in the vast Shan state area.

Skeptical at first but eager to explore the offer, Wolff invited American diplomatic, narcotics and CIA officials in Thailand to a meeting where he laid out the strange Shan proposal.

At this private session, the authorities confirmed that the Englishman was an authentic Shan contact and that some of the handwritten reports of opium convoys agreed precisely with their own secret information. Our own sources report that both the State Department and CIA had also been approached by the Shan insurgents but that the negotiations had been aborted by Washington.

Wolff left it to the American officials in Bangkok to pursue the offer but asked for a quick progress report, fearing the unorthodox Shan gambit might become snarled in red tape and bureaucratic timidity. When Wolff reached Hong Kong four days later, he was called by his Shan contact, who reported nothing whatsoever was being done about the Shan offer.

At our request, Wolff has now agreed to show us the proposal in hopes this might stir at least preliminary talks on the feasibility of buying up the Shan opium crop. After all, the United States has subsidized Turkish opium farmers with $35 million a year so they would stop growing the lethal stuff. The United States also secretly paid $1 million to Chinese traffickers and others in Thailand for contraband opium, which was burned. (A secret CIA report claims, however, that the U.S. authorities were deceived and really burned cheap fodder covered with opium.)

Wolff's document, typed beneath the crossed swords letterhead of the Shan State Army, is titled "Proposals to Terminate the Opium Trade in Shan State." It begins:

"The Shan State Army and its allies will invite . . . the United States Narcotics Bureau, or any similar body, to visit the opium areas of Shan State and to transmit information about opium convoys on their own wireless.

"The S.S.A. and its allies will ensure that all opium controlled by their armies is burnt under international supervision. The opium will be sold at a price to be negotiated later, but the basis . . . should be the Thai border price." At present, this would amount to roughly $12 million for 400 tons of opium.

In return for these "temporary measures," the Shan armies want a "permanent solution" based on political self-determination for the Shans and agricultural assistance from the United States to "replace opium with other crops." If this is finally accomplished, promise the Shan leaders, they will "allow helicopters under international supervision to search out and destroy any opium fields that still remain."

In Wolff's view, the advantage of destroying 400 tons of opium far outweighs the ruffling of official Burmese feathers which direct dealings with the Shans would cause.

Our own CIA sources confirm that the Shan State Army is a tremendous factor in the Southeast Asian drug traffic. One secret report by the CIA's Basic and Geographic Intelligence Office asserts: "The Shan State Army, the largest of several forces that have been fighting for Shan independence from Burma . . . is also heavily involved in the opium business."

Another CIA document tells of caravans of "up to 300 horses and donkeys and 300 to 400 men . . . carrying in excess of 16 tons" moving out of the Shan State. Classified CIA and Justice Department documents say 400 tons of the 700 to 750 tons of opium produced in Southeast Asia come from Burma, much of it from regions controlled or near the Shan State armies.

Wolff, while reluctant to leave Congress during the wind-up of the 1973 session, is willing to serve as an emissary to the Shan generals if it will help get negotiations going. Although he is unwilling to vouch for the Shan generals' ability to deliver on their proposals, he feels they at least warrant serious talk. "So far," he told us, "the U.S. government seems far more eager to wipe out insurgents than to wipe out the heroin trade."